## Message

From: Weinstock, Lewis [Weinstock.Lewis@epa.gov]

**Sent**: 3/2/2017 2:21:01 PM

To: Compher, Michael [compher.michael@epa.gov]

**Subject**: RE: Agenda items for next weeks QA Call

Sensitivity: Company Confidential

Thanks. As you may have seen from the recent QA thread, Reg's 1, 3, and 4 have reiterated their strong support for the concepts in the ozone QA memo. These concepts are rooted in the CFR and the QA Handbook, and represent the legal basis for data defensibility that would be reviewed by the IG or any legal authorities. Jesse may not be wrong when operating in a more theoretical world of statistical distributions but we collectively live in a world where each piece of data must be directly tied to a critical criteria to be considered valid (I know you get this).

Thanks for forwarding the message. We should always be able to listen to and consider alternative viewpoints but sometimes the majority view/policy rules the day. That can be a difficult pill to swallow for some people.

Lewis Weinstock | Group Leader | Ambient Air Monitoring Group | Air Quality Assessment Division - Mail Code C304-06 | Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Research Triangle Park, NC 27711 | Phone: 919-541-3661|

From: Compher, Michael

Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 9:12 AM

To: Weinstock, Lewis < Weinstock.Lewis@epa.gov > Subject: FW: Agenda items for next weeks QA Call

Sensitivity: Confidential

Lew – See the internal comment from Jesse below, shared with my Branch Chief and ADD. This is Jesse's opinion, not necessarily the opinion of R5.

Michael Compher Chief, Air Monitoring and Analysis Section Region 5 Air and Radiation Division U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Phone: 312-886-5745

From: McGrath, Jesse

**Sent:** Thursday, March 02, 2017 8:02 AM

To: Nam, Ed <nam.ed@epa.gov>; Siegel, Kathryn <siegel.kathryn@epa.gov>; Compher, Michael

<compher.michael@epa.gov>; Hamilton, Scott <hamilton.scott@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: Agenda items for next weeks QA Call

This is the only thing I'll need to add to the meeting.

If you invalidate data as outlined in that memo, you will be committing fraud.

Whoever fed that quote to the IG cherry-picked it and grossly took it out of context, to the point they could be accused of lying in an investigation.

The long-standing insistence that you can't invalidate data simply for being at the extremes of your distribution is taught in every basic science course to prevent exactly what this memo proposes, and is repeated as nauseum in the CFR and guidance.

The only message that needs to go to OAQPS is that the CFR and guidance say clearly not to do this, and that the states invalidate data on a case-by-case basis, which is consistent with the guidance.

From: Hamilton, Scott

**Sent:** Thursday, March 02, 2017 7:20 AM **To:** McGrath, Jesse < mcgrath.jesse@epa.gov > **Subject:** FW: Agenda items for next weeks QA Call

Scott Hamilton
Air Monitoring and Analysis Section
Air and Radiation Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Phone: 312-353-4775

From: Papp, Michael

Sent: Wednesday, March 01, 2017 11:33 AM

To: Ackerman, Laura <ackerman.Laura@epa.gov>; Carlson, Albion <Carlson.Albion@epa.gov>; Hass, Andrew <a href="mailto:</a>, Ross, Anthony <a href="mailto:</a>, Teitz, Avraham <a href="mailto:Avraham@epa.gov"><a href="mailto:Avraham@ep Anthony <br/>
<br/>
| Anthony <br/>
| Anthony <br/>
| Anthony <br/>
| Brown, Ethan <br/>
| Br Chris < Hall. Christopher@epa.gov>; Compher, Michael < compher.michael@epa.gov>; Coughlin, Justin <coughlin.justin@epa.gov>; France, Danny <France.Danny@epa.gov>; Davis, Michael <Davis.Michael@epa.gov>; Crumpler, Dennis < Crumpler. Dennis@epa.gov >; Jager, Doug < Jager. Doug@epa.gov >; Clover, Fletcher <Clover.Fletcher@epa.gov>; Gaige, Elizabeth < Gaige. Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Garver, Daniel < Garver.Daniel@epa.gov>; Noah, Greg < Noah. Greg@epa.gov>; YOSHIMURA, GWEN < Yoshimura. Gwen@epa.gov>; Harris, Keith <Harris.Keith@epa.gov>; Hoyer, Marion <hoyer.marion@epa.gov>; Jackson, Clarence <Jackson.Clarence@epa.gov>; Regehr, James <Regehr.James@epa.gov>; Williams, Jennifer <Williams.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Rickard, Joshua <Rickard.Joshua@epa.gov>; Judge, Robert < Judge.Robert@epa.gov>; Allen, Kara < Allen.Kara@epa.gov>; Hence, Kia <hence.kia@epa.gov>; Biland, Larry <Biland,Larry@epa.gov>; Grooms, Leland <Grooms,Leland@epa.gov>; Limaye, Vijay <<u>Limaye.Vijay@epa.gov>; Sena, Lorenzo <Sena.Lorenzo@epa.gov>; Hyden, Loretta <Hyden.Loretta@epa.gov>;</u> Lehrman, Loretta <a href="mailto:lehrman.loretta@epa.gov">!ehrman, Loretta@epa.gov</a>; Shanis, Mark <a href="mailto:Shanis.Mark@epa.gov">|Shanis.Mark@epa.gov</a>; Cuzzupe, Mary Jane < <u>Cuzzupe MaryJane@epa.gov</u>>; Plate, Mathew < <u>Plate Mathew@epa.gov</u>>; McCarthy, Stephanie <<u>McCarthy.Stephanie@epa.gov</u>>; McEvoy, Chad <<u>mcevoy.chad@epa.gov</u>>; Mebust, Anna <<u>Mebust.Anna@epa.gov</u>>; Kurpius, Meredith < <a href="Kurpius Meredith@epa.gov">Kurpius, Michael < Davis Michael@epa.gov</a>; Flagg, MichaelA <Flagg, Michael A@epa.gov>; Crowe, Mike < Crowe. Mike@epa.gov>; Miller, Michael < Miller. Michael@epa.gov>; Paguia, Monica <paguia.monica@epa.gov>; Mustafa, Mustafa <Mustafa.Mustafa@epa.gov>; Parker, Cindy <parker.cindy@epa.gov>; Kahn, Peter R. <kahn.peter@epa.gov>; Ramkissoon, Reshma <Ramkissoon.Reshma@epa.gov>; CHANG, RANDALL <Chang.Randall@epa.gov>; Regehr, James <Regehr\_James@epa.gov>; Guillot, Richard <Guillot, Richard@epa.gov>; Payton, Richard <Payton.Richard@epa.gov>; Coats, Robert < Coats. Robert @epa.gov>; Sakamoto, Roseanne < Sakamoto. Roseanne @epa.gov>; Brown, Ryan <Brown Ryan@epa.gov>; Waterson, Sara <Waterson.Sara@epa.gov>; Hamilton, Scott <hamilton.scott@epa.gov>; Ricks, Solomon <Ricks.Solomon@epa.gov>; Taylor, Catherine <taylor.catherine@epa.gov>; Bui, Thien <Bui.Thien@epa.gov>; Thompson, Alysha <Thompson.Alysha@epa.gov>; Curran, Trisha <Curran.Trisha@epa.gov>; Tufts, Jenia <Tufts.Jenia@epa.gov>; Vallano, Dena <Vallano.Dena@epa.gov>; Verhalen, Frances <verhalen.frances@epa.gov>; Zachary, Adam <zachary.adam@epa.gov>

Subject: Agenda items for next weeks QA Call

Please provide me with agenda items for the next call.

One big item that will be discussed is the issue brought up on the last Regional Office Call about the OIG alert and what to do about monitoring organizations not meeting the 1-point QC checks. After the Regional call, OAQPS and Region 4

met to discuss the South Carolina data and our suggestion was that R4 request SC invalidation of any data not meeting the 1-point QC acceptance criteria (7% precision and  $\pm$  7% bias) as described in the SC QAPP.

In order for some level of consistency across the nation we drafted the attached memo. At present this is a draft but it reflects OAQPS position on the acceptance criteria. Ben Wells has done some evaluations and is also attached.

Also I'd like to discuss the June Meeting. Response n the dates are as follows. Based on this my suggestion in week of June 26<sup>th</sup>. I realize that with uncertainty in budgets and travel this may not come to fruition.

Regions	Date
1	either
2	June 26
3	either
4	June 26
5	either
6	either
7	either
8	
9	either
10	June 19;

Mike Papp EPA Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards Ambient Air Monitoring Group Research Triangle Park, NC 919-541-2408

